Prepared for Utah Department of Workforce Services, Office of Work and Family Life 140 East 300 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
801-526-4340
http://jobs.utah.gov/occ/

Table of Contents	
Introduction Methodology Data	Page 4
Tables	
Table 1 Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 0 through 11 Months Old	Page 5
Table 2 Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 12 Month through 23 Month Olds	Page 6
Table 3 Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 2 Year Olds	Page 7
Table 4 Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 3 Year Olds	Page 8
Table 5 Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density 4 and 5 Year Olds	Page 9
Table 6 Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density Kindergarten (6 Year Olds)	Page 10
Table 7  Available Spaces, Vacancies, Child Population, Child Care Density  1 <sup>st</sup> through 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade (7 to 12 Year Olds)	Page 11
Table 8 Child Population 13 to 17 Year Olds	Page 12
Table 9 Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) Agencies Serving Utah	Page 13
Table 10 Child Care Density Ratio 0 Through 11 Months Old	Page 14
Table 11 Child Care Density Ratio 12 Through 23 Months Old	Page 15

Table 12 Child Care Density Ratio 2 Year Olds	Page 16
Table 13 Child Care Density Ratio 3 Year Olds	Page 17
Table 14 Child Care Density Ratio 4 and 5 Year Olds	Page 18
Table 15 Child Care Density Ratio Kindergarten	Page 19
Table 16 Child Care Density Ratio 1st Through 6th Grade	Page 20

#### Introduction

The Office of Work and Family Life (formerly the Office of Child Care) prepares a child care needs assessment at least once a year. It is a tool to assist staff and the community to determine where child care need is the greatest and where scarce resources need to be distributed.

This needs assessment reports on child care supply in each of Utah's twenty-nine counties. Child care demand or need is estimated based on child care density (CCD). The last needs assessment produced by the Office of Child Care was prepared April through June of 2006.

Utah's child care resource and referral (CCR&R) agencies are a source for information on child care needs. Customer surveys are given to parents receiving child care referrals through the CCR&Rs. The survey includes questions about child care need and the challenges to finding care.

#### Methodology

Needs assessment instruments vary from simple to complex. Some instruments include parent work patterns, where parents work, child care accessibility at the workplace or home, family income, and number of working parents-whether a single parent in the workforce or two-parent families with both parents employed. More complex instruments use birth data, county growth projections, and look at child care provider waiting lists.

The methodology used for this assessment is based on a model developed by Gwen Morgan, a child care systems expert from Wheelock College. Dr. Morgan recommends, "that a community should have about 25 spaces per every 100 children". This ratio of child care spaces to child population is called child care density. A child care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

#### Data

Child care providers listed with Utah's network of regional child care recourses and referral (CCR&R) agencies are used in this study. The CCR&Rs contracted by the Office of Work and Family Life, obtain initial information about child care providers from the Department of Health and the Office of Child Care Licensing. Each CCR&R surveys the community for all types of after school programs. Each CCR&R also augments provider data with rates, spaces and vacancies along with other information. Data are updated by the CCR&Rs at least twice a year. Inclusion on CCR&R databases is voluntary and some child care providers opt out.

Space and vacancy data are snapshots in time. Space and vacancy data may not accurately reflect child care supply and demand in a county. Spaces may be concentrated in one area of a county while the demand for care may be in another part of the county. Space and vacancy data are from FY 2007 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter reports (Oct-Dec 2006).

Child care spaces for the purposes of this study are available spaces. Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take, and could be different from what they may be licensed to take. For example, if a family provider is licensed for 8 children, but only wants to care for 6 children and won't take more than 6, then 6 is the reported available spaces.

The number of available spaces may often be less than the number of licensed spaces, but it will never be more than the number of licensed spaces. This may be a more reliable number to use when calculating the availability of child care or need for child care. If a regulated provider is unwilling to fill a certain number of spaces she/he is licensed for, then for all practical purposes those spaces are not available.

Vacancy information is provided to show space utilization. High vacancy percentages may indicate low demand or may be an indicator of the quality of care provided.

The child population data are 2007 projections provided by the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. The projections are based on 2000 census data.

Child Care Density (CCD) is calculated using the number of regulated spaces per 100 children (all children). The child population represents children in the following age groups: 0 through 11 months, over 1 year but less than 2 years, 2 years, 3 years, 4 and 5 year, 6 years, and 7 to 12 years.

It is to be noted that smaller numbers tend to skew percentages.

TABLE 1 2007 Child Care Needs Assessment 0 Through 11 Months Old

	Available Spaces for	Spaces Vacant or Not Used			
	•	UI INUL USEU			Child Care
	101	for	Percent	Child	Density Ratio*
County	0 through 11	0 through 11	Spaces Vacant	Population	
	Months Old	Months Old	or Not Used	< 1 Year Old	2007
Beaver	14	2	14.3%	131	11
Box Elder	131	20	15.3%	806	16
Cache	242	42	17.4%	2,506	10
Carbon	44	2	4.5%	301	15
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	10	0
Davis	518	175	33.8%	5,753	9
Duchesne	33	1	3.0%	292	11
Emery	8	3	37.5%	155	5
Garfield	4	0	0.0%	67	6
Grand	23	7	30.4%	97	24
Iron	105	29	27.6%	884	12
Juab	36	12	33.3%	181	20
Kane	10	1	10.0%	78	13
Millard	32	7	21.9%	185	17
Morgan	16	2	12.5%	124	13
Piute	0	0	0.0%	18	0
Rich	0	0	0.0%	34	0
Salt Lake	1,545	211	13.7%	19,025	8
San Juan	30	5	16.7%	205	15
Sanpete	47	6	12.8%	402	12
Sevier	55	9	16.4%	342	16
Summit	101	5	5.0%	605	17
Tooele	52	8	15.4%	1,222	4
Uintah	32	6	18.8%	502	6
Utah	729	122	16.7%	11,938	6
Wasatch	33	4	12.1%	447	7
Washington	200	21	10.5%	2,591	8
Wayne	4	0	0.0%	36	11
Weber	510	76	14.9%	4,103	12
Totals	4,554	776		53,040	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 2 2007 Child Care Needs Assessment 12 Through 23 Months Old

		Spaces Vacant		Child	
	Available Spaces	or Not Used		Population	Child Care
	for	for	Percent	< 1 Year Old and	Density Ratio*
County	12 through 23	12 through 23	Spaces Vacant	Less Than 2	
,	Months Old	Months Old	or Not Used	Years Old	2007
Beaver	14	2	14.3%	129	11
Box Elder	137	23	16.8%	784	17
Cache	245	47	19.2%	2,491	10
Carbon	44	2	4.5%	309	14
Daggett	0	0		7	0
Davis	547	70	12.8%	5,762	9
Duchesne	33	1	3.0%	274	12
Emery	9	3	33.3%	156	6
Garfield	4	0	0.0%	67	6
Grand	23	7	30.4%	93	25
Iron	107	30	28.0%	866	12
Juab	36	12	33.3%	176	20
Kane	10	3	30.0%	73	14
Millard	32	7	21.9%	183	17
Morgan	16	2	12.5%	124	13
Piute	0	0		18	0
Rich	4	4	100.0%	35	11
Salt Lake	1,870	239	12.8%	18,821	10
San Juan	30	5	16.7%	208	14
Sanpete	52	6	11.5%	407	13
Sevier	56	9	16.1%	344	16
Summit	115		0.0%	595	19
Tooele	6	9	150.0%	1,174	1
Uintah	32	6	18.8%	497	6
Utah	769	127	16.5%	11,720	7
Wasatch	35	4	11.4%	441	8
Washington	202	21	10.4%	2,550	8
Wayne	4	0	0.0%	36	11
Weber	562	80	14.2%	4,035	14
Totals	4,994	719		52,375	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 3
2007 Child Care Needs Assessment
2 Year Olds

		Spaces Vacant			Child Care
	Available Spaces				Density
	for	for	Percent	Child	Ratio*
County	2 Year	2 year	Spaces Vacant	Population	I
	Olds	Olds	or Not Used	2 Year Olds	2007
Beaver	52	17	32.7%	67	78
Box Elder	547	122	22.3%	800	68
Cache	939	198	21.1%	2,429	39
Carbon	174	14	8.0%	293	59
Daggett	0	0	0.070	11	0
Davis	1,948	196	10.1%	5,644	35
Duchesne	140	6	4.3%	297	47
Emery	58	8	13.8%	156	37
Garfield	16	0	0.0%	67	24
Grand	73	16	21.9%	100	73
Iron	514	108	21.0%	858	60
Juab	132	46	34.8%	175	75
Kane	39	15	38.5%	80	49
Millard	132	41	31.1%	188	70
Morgan	46	3	6.5%	127	36
Piute	0	0		18	0
Rich	24	7	29.2%	34	71
Salt Lake	5,437	894	16.4%	18,809	29
San Juan	113	9	8.0%	201	56
Sanpete	221	26	11.8%	396	56
Sevier	259	58	22.4%	330	78
Summit	420	52	12.4%	600	70
Tooele	220	30	13.6%	1,160	19
Uintah	217	11	5.1%	497	44
Utah	3,721	502	13.5%	11,588	32
Wasatch	101	12	11.9%	436	23
Washington	891	108	12.1%	2,437	37
Wayne	14	0	0.0%	35	40
Weber	2,083	311	14.9%	4,064	51
Totals	18,531	2,810		51,897	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 4
2007 Child Care Needs Assessment
3 Year Olds

	Available Spaces	Spaces Vacant or Not Used			Child Care Density
	for	for	Percent	Child	Ratio*
County	3 Year	3 Year	Spaces Vacant	Population	
	Olds	Olds	or Not Used	3 Years Old	2007
Beaver	52	17	32.7%	134	39
Box Elder	564	122	21.6%	780	72
Cache	967	210	21.7%	2,452	39
Carbon	174	14	8.0%	323	54
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	5	0
Davis	2,056	281	13.7%	5,719	36
Duchesne	140	13	9.3%	265	53
Emery	58	8	13.8%	153	38
Garfield	16	0	0.0%	70	23
Grand	73	16	21.9%	91	80
Iron	514	109	21.2%	852	60
Juab	132	46	34.8%	174	76
Kane	39	15	38.5%	71	55
Millard	137	41	29.9%	180	76
Morgan	54	5	9.3%	124	44
Piute	0	0	0.0%	19	0
Rich	28	12	42.9%	36	78
Salt Lake	6,658	1,148	17.2%	18,509	36
San Juan	113	9	8.0%	210	54
Sanpete	221	36	16.3%	416	53
Sevier	259	59	22.8%	353	73
Summit	462	46	10.0%	591	78
Tooele	232	41	17.7%	1,148	20
Uintah	217	11	5.1%	498	44
Utah	3,833	512	13.4%	11,250	34
Wasatch	108	14	13.0%	433	25
Washington	927	161	17.4%	2,405	39
Wayne	14	0	0.0%	38	37
Weber	2,333	350	15.0%	4,019	58
Totals	20,381	3,296		51,318	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 5
2007 Child Care Needs Assessment
4 and 5 Year Olds

		Spaces Vacant			Child Care
	Available Spaces	or Not Used		Child	Density
	for	for	Percent	Population	Ratio*
County	4 and 5	4 and 5	Spaces Vacant	4 and 5 Year	
, and the second	Year Olds	Year Olds	or Not Used	Olds	2007
Beaver	52	17	32.7%	235	22
Box Elder	567	122	21.5%	1,601	35
Cache	980	221	22.6%	4,592	21
Carbon	174	14	8.0%	552	32
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	25	0
Davis	2,199	308	14.0%	10,714	21
Duchesne	140	13	9.3%	586	24
Emery	58	9	15.5%	309	19
Garfield	16	0	0.0%	136	12
Grand	73	16	21.9%	228	32
Iron	513	108	21.1%	1,659	31
Juab	132	46	34.8%	357	37
Kane	39	15	38.5%	172	23
Millard	137	41	29.9%	399	34
Morgan	59	6	10.2%	240	25
Piute	0	0	0.0%	35	0
Rich	30	15	50.0%	55	55
Salt Lake	7,404	1,226	16.6%	36,440	20
San Juan	97	7	7.2%	410	24
Sanpete	221	35	15.8%	798	28
Sevier	259	59	22.8%	632	41
Summit	503	80	15.9%	1,199	42
Tooele	242	44	18.2%	2,270	11
Uintah	217	11	5.1%	950	23
Utah	3,853	557	14.5%	22,068	17
Wasatch	108	19	17.6%	864	13
Washington	938	160	17.1%	4,395	21
Wayne	14	0	0.0%	77	18
Weber	2,384	371	15.6%	7,990	30
Totals	21,409	3,520		99,988	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 6 2007 Child Care Needs Assessment Kindergarten

		Spaces Vacant			Child Care
	Available Spaces	or Not Used			Density
	for	for	Percent	Child	Ratio*
County	Kindergarten	Kindergarten	Spaces Vacant	Population	
			or Not Used	6 Years Old	2007
Beaver	52	15	28.8%	115	45
Box Elder	719	138	19.2%	775	93
Cache	1,067	305	28.6%	2,188	49
Carbon	256	14	5.5%	247	104
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	14	0
Davis	1,994	194	9.7%	5,183	38
Duchesne	140	9	6.4%	283	49
Emery	58	9	15.5%	147	39
Garfield	16	0	0.0%	63	25
Grand	73	16	21.9%	14	521
Iron	462	106	22.9%	848	54
Juab	132	42	31.8%	176	75
Kane	39	15	38.5%	76	51
Millard	129	41	31.8%	196	66
Morgan	54	8	14.8%	140	39
Piute	0	0	0.0%	21	0
Rich	19	22	115.8%	21	90
Salt Lake	7,395	1,238	16.7%	18,283	42
San Juan	97	6	6.2%	232	32
Sanpete	221	25	11.3%	425	52
Sevier	259	56	21.6%	343	76
Summit	456	49	10.7%	590	77
Tooele	246	34	13.8%	1,117	22
Uintah	286	11	3.8%	443	65
Utah	3,704	619	16.7%	10,910	34
Wasatch	102	11	10.8%	378	27
Washington	912	143	15.7%	2,005	45
Wayne	14	0	0.0%	39	36
Weber	2,080	249	12.0%	3,920	53
Totals	20,982	3,375		49,192	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

TABLE 7 2007 Child Care Needs Assessment 1st through 6th Grade

		Spaces Vacant			Child Care
	Available Spaces			Child	Density
	for	for	Percent	Population	Ratio*
County	1 through 6	1 through 6	Spaces Vacant	7 to 12	
,	Grade	Grade	or Not Used	Years Old	2007
Beaver	52	15	28.8%	678	8
Box Elder	666	126	18.9%	4,760	14
Cache	1,513	441	29.1%	10,788	14
Carbon	281	14	5.0%	1,546	18
Daggett	0	0	0.0%	70	0
Davis	2,417	171	7.1%	29,879	8
Duchesne	132	9	6.8%	1,535	9
Emery	49	9	18.4%	932	5
Garfield	16	0	0.0%	463	3
Grand	73	16	21.9%	705	10
Iron	462	105	22.7%	3,826	12
Juab	132	42	31.8%	1,094	12
Kane	39	15	38.5%	503	8
Millard	129	43	33.3%	1,289	10
Morgan	60	5	8.3%	810	7
Piute	0	0	0.0%	137	0
Rich	19	22	115.8%	183	10
Salt Lake	7,351	1,287	17.5%	93,163	8
San Juan	97	6	6.2%	1,567	5
Sanpete	182	25	13.7%	2,456	7
Sevier	259	56	21.6%	1,926	13
Summit	366	25	6.8%	3,251	11
Tooele	245	38	15.5%	6,370	4
Uintah	414	11	2.7%	2,443	17
Utah	3,510	607	17.3%	53,041	8
Wasatch	102	11	10.8%	2,162	5
Washington	882	107	12.1%	11,662	8
Wayne	14	0	0.0%	266	5
Weber	2,587	259	10.0%	21,459	12
Totals	22,049	3,465		258,964	

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

Available spaces are the number of spaces a regulated provider is actually willing to take.

 $\label{thm:maps} \mbox{Smaller numbers may skew percentages}.$ 

TABLE 8 2007 Child Care Needs Assessment Child Population

County	13 year Olds	14 year Olds	15 year Olds	16 year Olds	17 year Olds
Beaver	105	116	117	115	117 Jean Olas
Box Elder	788	842	806	876	883
Cache	1,490	1,449	1,458	1,500	1,479
Carbon	252	251	282	286	296
Daggett	13	13	12	8	8
Dayis	4,665	4,769	4,782	4,834	4,906
Duchesne	258	297	295	265	268
Emery	152	166	212	206	207
Garfield	68	63	80	88	73
Grand	106	119	120	125	128
Iron	638	647	628	632	640
Juab	172	176	190	185	185
Kane	84	86	97	102	110
Millard	235	255	258	270	249
Morgan	131	150	156	177	181
Piute	24	18	24	16	24
Rich	34	31	34	37	47
Salt Lake	14,804	14,762	14,671	14,881	14,854
San Juan	288	305	323	320	335
Sanpete	417	420	445	444	410
Sevier	300	317	340	354	360
Summit	570	563	581	609	634
Tooele	960	938	932	876	888
Uintah	405	434	440	474	469
Utah	7,516	7,367	7,429	7,435	7,239
Wasatch	344	365	352	369	352
Washington	1,839	1,900	1,953	2,037	2,079
Wayne	51	47	45	37	46
Weber	3,279	3,278	3,300	3,340	3,401
Totals	39,988	40,144	40,362	40,898	40,868

TABLE 9
2007 CHILD Care Needs Assessment
Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) Agencies Serving Utah

Agency	Contact Agent	Counties Served
CCR&R Bridgerland	Utah State University	Box Elder, Cache, and Rich
CCR&R Eastern	College of Eastern Utah	Carbon, Daggett, Duchesne, Emery, Grand San Juan, and Uintah
CCR&R Metro	Children's Services Society of Utah	Salt Lake and Tooele
CCR&R Mountainland	Utah Valley State College	Utah, Summit and Weber
CCR&R Northern	Weber State University	Davis, Morgan and Weber
CCR&R Western	Five County Association of Governments	Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Juab, Kane, Millard Piute, Sanpete, Sevier, Washington, and Wayne

TABLE 10
2007 Child Care Needs Assessment
0 Through 11 Months Old
Child Care Density Ratio\*

Chilla Care Density Ratio					
County	2004	2005	2006	2007	
Beaver	14	13	11	11	
Box Elder	13	14	16	16	
Cache	11	9	9	10	
Carbon	18	14	14	15	
Daggett	0	0	0	0	
Davis	10	9	9	9	
Duchesne	16	14	14	11	
Emery	11	6	7	5	
Garfield	9	9	15	6	
Grand	16	14	18	24	
Iron	16	24	26	12	
Juab	24	19	20	20	
Kane	9	11	17	13	
Millard	10	12	17	17	
Morgan	8	12	13	13	
Piute	6	3	0	0	
Rich	0	0	6	0	
Salt Lake	6	7	9	8	
San Juan	10	13	12	15	
Sanpete	14	14	15	12	
Sevier	30	30	23	16	
Summit	10	20	13	17	
Tooele	4	4	4	4	
Uintah	10	8	8	6	
Utah	5	6	7	6	
Wasatch	9	12	12	7	
Washington	15	11	9	8	
Wayne	41	42	22	11	
Weber	12	11	12	12	

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}$ Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 11
2007 Child Care Needs Assessment
12 Through 23 Months Old
Child Care Density Ratio\*

Ciliu Cale Delisity Ratio						
County	2004	2005	2006	2007		
Beaver	16	15	22	11		
Box Elder	17	17	16	17		
Cache	14	10	10	10		
Carbon	14	16	15	14		
Daggett		0	0	0		
Davis	11	10	10	9		
Duchesne	16	10	13	12		
Emery	15	9	8	6		
Garfield	7	9	15	6		
Grand	16	12	17	25		
Iron	15	24	26	12		
Juab	21	19	20	20		
Kane	11	9	15	14		
Millard	10	11	16	17		
Morgan	12	12	13	13		
Piute	13	3	0	0		
Rich		0	6	11		
Salt Lake	8	8	10	10		
San Juan	10	14	13	14		
Sanpete	15	17	17	13		
Sevier	40	33	24	16		
Summit	15	21	16	19		
Tooele	6	5	5	1		
Uintah	5	9	8	6		
Utah	6	7	7	7		
Wasatch	10	13	13	8		
Washington	14	12	10	8		
Wayne	46	48	23	11		
Weber	13	12	14	14		
-		-				

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}\text{Child}$  Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 12 2007 Child Care Needs Assessment 2 Year Olds Child Care Density Ratio\*

Office Defisity Natio						
County	2004	2005	2006	2007		
Beaver	52	54	38	78		
Box Elder	61	58	68	68		
Cache	48	34	38	39		
Carbon	95	59	52	59		
Daggett	100	64	0	0		
Davis	46	38	37	35		
Duchesne	82	65	52	47		
Emery	51	43	46	37		
Garfield	28	31	27	24		
Grand	66	50	87	73		
Iron	68	66	71	60		
Juab	75	77	78	75		
Kane	31	31	61	49		
Millard	34	49	73	70		
Morgan	31	55	53	36		
Piute	35	10	0	0		
Rich	0	0	19	71		
Salt Lake	23	25	30	29		
San Juan	50	43	44	56		
Sanpete	60	64	65	56		
Sevier	113	133	97	78		
Summit	29	102	66	70		
Tooele	16	16	20	19		
Uintah	53	42	37	44		
Utah	18	36	36	32		
Wasatch	27	44	41	23		
Washington	65	51	44	37		
Wayne	136	139	71	40		
Weber	48	43	48	51		
ļ <del></del>						

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 13
2007 Child Care Needs Assessment
3 Year Olds
Child Care Density Ratio\*

County	2004	2005	2006	2007
Beaver	64	56	44	39
Box Elder	63	65	69	72
Cache	60	40	42	39
Carbon	78	71	61	54
Daggett	156	50	0	0
Davis	47	42	41	36
Duchesne	69	64	45	53
Emery	86	49	46	38
Garfield	23	36	63	23
Grand	50	55	76	80
Iron	97	64	73	60
Juab	73	80	78	76
Kane	49	36	58	55
Millard	47	55	71	76
Morgan	51	46	57	44
Piute	25	8	0	0
Rich		0	21	78
Salt Lake	29	31	33	36
San Juan	38	40	47	54
Sanpete	65	63	72	53
Sevier	137	123	112	73
Summit	43	105	71	78
Tooele	23	18	22	20
Uintah	58	44	38	44
Utah	22	36	37	34
Wasatch	24	51	44	25
Washington	67	57	49	39
Wayne	194	156	82	37
Weber	56	51	54	58

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}\text{Child}$  Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

# TABLE 14 2007 Child Care Needs Assessment 4 and 5 Year Olds Child Care Density Ratio\*

Office Defisity Natio						
County	2004	2005	2006	2007		
Beaver	30	27	22	22		
Box Elder	35	31	35	35		
Cache	32	22	22	21		
Carbon	33	33	32	32		
Daggett	50	27	0	0		
Davis	26	22	23	21		
Duchesne	41	34	25	24		
Emery	35	24	23	19		
Garfield	16	16	30	12		
Grand	27	27	33	32		
Iron	48	33	36	31		
Juab	39	38	38	37		
Kane	18	17	30	23		
Millard	19	27	34	34		
Morgan	18	30	31	25		
Piute	18	4	0	0		
Rich		0	16	55		
Salt Lake	16	18	18	20		
San Juan	13	15	17	24		
Sanpete	31	32	32	28		
Sevier	64	68	53	41		
Summit	19	56	41	42		
Tooele	11	10	11	11		
Uintah	27	23	20	23		
Utah	11	20	19	17		
Wasatch	14	26	23	13		
Washington	35	29	26	21		
Wayne	69	68	33	18		
Weber	28	27	28	30		

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 15 2007 Child Care Needs Assessment Kindergarten Child Care Density Ratio\*

County	2004	2005	2006	2007
Beaver	80	52	42	45
Box Elder	73	71	88	93
Cache	66	47	49	49
Carbon	58	65	84	104
Daggett	636	238	0	0
Davis	42	41	42	38
Duchesne	187	113	77	49
Emery	65	41	49	39
Garfield	37	26	65	25
Grand	84	50	67	521
Iron	82	72	68	54
Juab	96	73	78	75
Kane	35	24	58	51
Millard	33	48	65	66
Morgan	38	46	67	39
Piute	21	8	0	0
Rich		0	30	90
Salt Lake	38	42	42	42
San Juan	28	32	32	32
Sanpete	68	66	65	52
Sevier	119	130	112	76
Summit	35	110	81	77
Tooele	24	21	25	22
Uintah	168	129	75	65
Utah	22	44	39	34
Wasatch	26	90	119	27
Washington	80	57	52	45
Wayne	116	145	56	36
Weber	50	51	52	53

<sup>\*</sup>Child Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

TABLE 16 2007 Child Care Needs Assessment 1st Through 6th Grade Child Care Density Ratio\*

County	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Beaver	2	10	10	8	7
Box Elder	6	10	10	13	14
Cache	7	15	13	14	14
Carbon	4	19	15	17	18
Daggett	5	131	80	0	0
Davis	4	7	7	9	8
Duchesne	3	27	23	13	9
Emery	0	9	7	7	5
Garfield	1	5	5	9	3
Grand	3	8	7	11	10
Iron	8	14	13	14	12
Juab	4	13	12	12	12
Kane	0	5	4	10	8
Millard	3	5	7	10	10
Morgan	2	5	6	7	7
Piute	24	6	1	0	0
Rich	0	0	0	4	10
Salt Lake	5	6	7	8	8
San Juan	1	4	5	5	5
Sanpete	3	9	11	8	7
Sevier	5	21	21	18	13
Summit	2	5	15	11	11
Tooele	3	5	4	5	4
Uintah	2	26	21	18	17
Utah	1	4	8	8	8
Wasatch	1	3	8	8	5
Washington	6	12	11	9	8
Wayne	8	24	22	10	5
Weber	6	8	10	12	12

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}\text{Child}$  Care density less than 25 may indicate a need for additional child care spaces.

<sup>2003</sup> Only available in this age breakout